



Jarrold Jones  
1850 W Orangethorpe Ave  
Fullerton, California, 92833  
(714) 497-0035  
jarrod@stangranch.com

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID A. STEBBINS,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JARROD JONES,

Defendant

Case No.: 8:24-cv-01486-JVS-KES

REPLY TO RESPONSE TO SETTLEMENT STATUS  
UPDATE

Comes now, Jarrod Jones, Pro Se, a reply in the above stylized motion. For  
brevity this will be formatted similar to that of an answer document, as I've noticed several lies  
within the Plaintiff's filing.

1. False, I've provided Mr. Stebbins with paperwork that would satisfy his requirements.
2. The software that Mr. Stebbins uses has a well-known glitch within the software that improperly opens .csv documents, as covered here:  
<https://forum.openoffice.org/en/forum/viewtopic.php?t=104343>, here:  
<https://forum.openoffice.org/en/forum/viewtopic.php?t=86489>, and here:  
<https://forum.openoffice.org/en/forum/viewtopic.php?t=102693> additionally,  
I've provided Mr. Stebbins with a readable PDF version of the statements, the same copy as I've provided to the Court. Mr. Stebbins is intentionally

1 omitting this fact to falsely claim that I have not fulfilled his requests is  
2 concerning.

- 3 3. I've provided receipts of my tax returns to Mr. Stebbins as they're the only  
4 paperwork readily, and quickly available to download from the IRS website. I  
5 lack the resources to obtain the filed 1040 Forms due to lack of readily  
6 available funds to obtain the proper paperwork, which is \$30 (Thirty dollars),  
7 per form. As Mr. Stebbins has shown so far that he is very impatient and  
8 demands everything immediately, I provided what I could instantly obtain  
9 from the IRS provides from their website, for free.  
10  
11 4. Yes, this is what a 1040 form looks like, but I have reason to believe that the  
12 wait to get those would be too long for Mr. Stebbins to wait as he would deem  
13 it as intentional slowing of the settlement process because it doesn't meet his  
14 instantaneous unreasonable demands.  
15  
16 5. The documentation provided is receipts from the IRS for those tax years. They  
17 are not forgeries; I've sent the documents to the Judge's chambers for further  
18 validation and verification.  
19  
20 6. I have provided documentation to Mr. Stebbins.  
21  
22 7. Evidence is complete as I can obtain them.  
23  
24 8. I made a mention that there was someone with a similar name in the area, but  
25 that's all I know. Could it be the person who makes \$150,000 to \$175,000 a  
26 year? Who knows? The information provided by Spokeo has the potential to  
27 be false. If I did have that amount of money I would have hired a lawyer  
28 rather than represent myself during this case.

1 9. Here is a lie from Mr. Stebbins, he requested that I find a person in the city of  
2 Everett, Washington. A place within Washington State that does not exist.  
3 (Exhibit A) and finding anyone living in that area would not be found as it  
4 does not exist. I had only corrected Mr. Stebbins on his spelling mistake a few  
5 days ago, but he touts it as if we have never gone over the correction or that  
6 the correction never happened and therefore does not exist.  
7

8 10. I mentioned that there was another Jarrod Jones in that general location, being  
9 in the Seattle area. I know from searching there's a Jarrod L. Jones, and  
10 another Jarrod M. Jones that have addresses in that area. However, this  
11 information did not placate Mr. Stebbins.  
12

13 11. Mr. Stebbins has a habit of misconstruing information and manipulating it to  
14 make it seem fact, recently the Northern District of California Courts tossed a  
15 case from him against YouTube and an unidentified user on the platform that  
16 goes under the username "Creetosis", the court's and Judge's response is  
17 included as Exhibit B. Mr. Stebbins is a known Vexatious Litigant in the  
18 Northern District of California. This leads me to believe that he is doubling  
19 down so he can increase his payout considering the losses of his complaint  
20 being tossed out by the Northern District of California.  
21

22 12. Spokeo's information is incorrectly attributed to me. I have only known low  
23 income and just above poverty my entire adult life. I've explained the service  
24 to the Honorable Magistrate the service, but I still must prove that it's not me.  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 13. I am compiling this list. A few companies in my employment history no  
2 longer exist, so phone numbers for them can't be provided nor do I remember  
3 my exact wages.

4  
5 14. I am not obligated to inform my employer of Mr. Stebbins' inquiry about my  
6 employment status within the company unless ordered by the court. As the  
7 headquarters of my company is in the Eastern United States of America, he  
8 should try calling them rather than sending an email.

9  
10 15. This is untrue. I've spent time struggling with verifying my identity at the IRS  
11 with their reliance on the horrendously designed ID.me system, and my Bank  
12 wanted to verify that I am also me, but their process was simpler.

13 16. This is irrelevant rambling to provide to the court.

14 17. As explained prior, I've had to fight with the ID.me system to verify my  
15 identity. It wasn't until I found a loophole in the verification process that I  
16 could verify even faster, as provided in my status update. These requests were  
17 identity verification pages that didn't provide enough information as to what I  
18 was doing, and showed plain photographs of my Birth Certificate and ID.  
19 Information that I felt was too pervasive to share, even if censored.

20  
21 18. This is an attack from Mr. Stebbins on my characterization.

22  
23 19. I have done nothing but provide reasonable cooperation with Mr. Stebbins  
24 every step of the way. I don't give any dates or times as I am thoroughly  
25 uncertain of when I am able to give his requests. This isn't me dodging  
26 deadlines nor wasting his time. What I have provided to Mr. Stebbins is what  
27 both the IRS and Bank have provided me with. They are not forgeries.  
28



1 20. This is irrelevant information provided to fluff up the page count of his  
2 response.

3 21. I should not be held accountable for what information the IRS provides for  
4 free without paying fees to obtain the paperwork.

5 22. This is factually incorrect; I've told Mr. Stebbins that it was I who made the  
6 error and that I'll contact my HR department asking them to redo my tax  
7 paperwork as I've filed it incorrectly.

8 23. In 2020 I saw a severe dip in my income due to the pandemic, working as a  
9 Grocery Reset Merchandiser saw that my position was non-essential to  
10 business, and I suffered a loss of income during the pandemic. The company  
11 only opened slightly during the later half of the year. In 2021 I suffered a  
12 work-related injury that put me out of work and onto the Washington State  
13 Labor and Industries Board's Workers Compensation program. My income  
14 generated from that is non-taxable. By the time I had entered the workforce  
15 again my taxable income was low enough to not file taxes, but I filed anyway  
16 due to receiving Worker's Comp and at the suggestion of a case worker.

17 24. Mr. Stebbins is not familiar with the paperwork he is looking at so it's very  
18 easy for him to, again, call forth that they're forgeries because it makes his  
19 plan to double down on this settlement for even more money after the above  
20 case in the Northern District of California Courts got tossed. He wants as  
21 much money as he can squeeze out of me, even though I do not have any  
22 assets nor investments beyond my car.

23 25. I have provided the documentation for the Court, and I'll let the court decide.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 26. I've been struggling with filing taxes due to the terrible ID.me system that the  
2 IRS relies on to verify identity and prevent fraud. I'll start the process of filing  
3 my 2022 tax returns.  
4

5 27. My issue with the IRS is irrelevant to this court case.

6 28. I've proven half of what Mr. Stebbins has given me, but his impatient and  
7 unreasonable responses, believing at every step I take in good faith is a sham.  
8 Mr. Stebbins is clearly unhappy with only getting \$1800 in settlement, and  
9 only wants more. He is aiming for the largest number of dollars he can  
10 allegedly obtain from me. This whole case has been born out of malice,  
11 improper copyright infringements, and greed, his initial want of maximum  
12 damages of \$150,000 is what he desires; wishing to utilize the United States  
13 Judicial System as a weapon rather than spend time on proper litigation in  
14 cases that are more deserving of the Court's time and effort. It shouldn't be a  
15 struggle to prove that someone, I am close to the poverty line, but Mr.  
16 Stebbins' reliance on falsified information provided by Spokeo has made this  
17 endeavor quite difficult.  
18  
19  
20

21 I pray to the court that Mr. Stebbins is held liable for blatantly lying to and  
22 misleading the court in his efforts to apply gamesmanship to the court system.  
23  
24

25 Dated this 19th of August 2024.

26  
27  
28  
  
Pro Se

# EXHIBIT A

---

**From:** Acerthorn <acerthorn@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 16, 2024 7:13 PM  
**To:** jarrod stangranch.com <jarro@stangranch.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Requests for proof of net worth

Sorry, I misspelled it: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Everett,\\_Washington](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Everett,_Washington)

On Friday, August 16, 2024 at 09:12:04 PM CDT, jarrod stangranch.com <jarro@stangranch.com> wrote:

Similar named Jarrod Jones in my area.

There is no town or city in Washington state named Everette.

You are asking me for information for a person in a place that does not exist.

---

**From:** Acerthorn <acerthorn@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 16, 2024 5:34 PM  
**To:** jarrod stangranch.com <jarro@stangranch.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Requests for proof of net worth

Oh my god, you completely forgot why I wanted to learn about the other Jarrod Jones, didn't you?!

You said in the mediation that there is another Jarrod Jones *in Everette, Washington*, and he was the one who actually had income of \$150k-\$175k.

I asked you to show proof of THAT!

None of these guys are from Everette, and you haven't shown me how any of them have income that could explain why you were reported as having it.

On Friday, August 16, 2024 at 01:05:09 PM CDT, jarrod stangranch.com <jarro@stangranch.com> wrote:

Thanks to the SSN databreach, and npd.pentester.com/search I've found numbers for one Jarrod Jones, and addresses for individuals that you seek.



# EXHIBIT B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID A. STEBBINS,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOHN DOE, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [24-mc-80179-HSG](#)

**ORDER BARRING FILING OF  
COMPLAINT**

*Pro se* Plaintiff seeks to bring a copyright infringement action YouTube, LLC. Dkt. No. 1. The Court reviews the proposed complaint in its capacity as General Duty Judge as required by a vexatious litigant order entered in August 2023, and directs the Clerk of Court not to accept the complaint for filing.

**I. PLAINTIFF’S LITIGATION HISTORY**

In the past few years, Plaintiff has filed numerous copyright infringement and/or defamation cases against YouTube or its affiliates. *See Stebbins v. Polano et al.*, No. 4:21-cv-04184-JSW (N.D. Cal. filed June 2, 2021); *Stebbins v. Rebolo et al.*, No. 4:22-cv00546-JSW (N.D. Cal. filed Jan. 27, 2022); *Stebbins v. Google LLC*, No. 3:23-cv-00322-TLT (N.D. Cal. filed Jan. 20, 2023). As the court noted in an August 2023 order finding Plaintiff to be a vexatious litigant, “it appears that the motive for Plaintiff’s . . . lawsuits [is] to stop harassment from other users online,” but “that is not a proper use of copyright law.” *Stebbins v. Google LLC*, 2023 WL 6139454, at \*10 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 31, 2023). In that order, the court found that prior to filing (1) any future actions against Google LLC, YouTube LLC, Alphabet Inc., or any of their affiliates, or (2) any claim of copyright infringement or copyright-related claims against any defendant, Plaintiff would be required to first provide a copy of his complaint and the order to the Clerk of


1 this Court, along with a letter requesting the complaint be filed. *Id.* at 11. The court warned  
2 Plaintiff warned that any violation of the order would expose him to contempt proceedings and  
3 appropriate sanctions, and any action filed in violation of its order would be subject to dismissal.  
4 *Id.*

5 **II. DETERMINATION REGARDING COMPLAINT**

6 Plaintiff now seeks to file another lawsuit against YouTube, LLC and one of YouTube's  
7 users. *See* Dkt. No. 1 ("Compl.") at 1. His complaint alleges "five counts of copyright  
8 infringement, two counts of libel, one count of intentional infliction of emotional distress, and one  
9 count of civil conspiracy." *Id.* This case falls squarely within the scope of the prior 2023  
10 vexatious litigant order, and repeats the same types of claims that have been repeatedly dismissed  
11 in that order and elsewhere. Having reviewed the proposed complaint in its capacity as General  
12 Duty Judge as required by the vexatious litigant order, this Court determines that the complaint is  
13 frivolous and meritless, and accordingly directs the Clerk of Court not to accept the complaint for  
14 filing. The Clerk is directed to close this miscellaneous file without permitting filing of the  
15 complaint.

16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17 Dated: 8/14/2024

18   
19 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.  
20 United States District Judge  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28